

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/916,781 | 07/27/2001 | Richard J. Roll | 2125.002USU | 8798 |
| 7: | 590 11/15/2006 | EXAMINER | | |
| | Ruggiero, Esq. | ZEENDER, FLORIAN M | | |
| Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P. 10th Floor One Landmark Square | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3627 | |
| Stamford, CT | 06901-2682 | | DATE MAILED: 11/15/2006 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Advisory Action | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/916,781 | ROLL ET AL. | | | | |
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | F. Ryan Zeender | 3627 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 23 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | | = | , 000 | | | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 | | FIRST REPLY WAS F | ILED WITHIN | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing data. | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Office of the final rejection, e | iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as even if timely filed, | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS | | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, | but prior to the date of filing a brief, | will not be entered be | ecause | | | |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further co | | ΓE below); | | | | |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13 | • • • | mpliant Amendment (| (PTOL-324). | | | |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-15. | | l be entered and an e | explanation of | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | d sufficient reasons why the affidav | it or other evidence is | s necessary and | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear y and was not earlier presented. Se | al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 | Is to provide a I). | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ned. | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu | | condition for allowar | nce because: | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| 13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | |
| | | | i i | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to the claims require further consideration/search.

Continuation of 13. Other: The applicant's argument with respect to the withdrawal of finality is not convincing in that applicant's amendment submitted 2/2/2006 overcame the rejection using Hager et al. This amendment necessitated the new ground of rejection in the final Office action using Stack. The finality of the action is proper due to the amendment.

F. RYAN ZEENDER PRIMARY EXAMINER